

REMARKS

This is a complete response to the outstanding Office Action mailed January 17, 2008. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 17, and 20 have been amended; claim 10 has been canceled; and claim 21 has been added herein. Support for new claim 21 and amended claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 17, and 20 may be found in, for example, original specification paragraph [0016]. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of the enclosed claim amendments, claims 1-9 and 11-21 remain pending in the present application.

I. Response to Claim Objections

Applicant amended claim 20 which now makes the Office's prior objection moot. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review and respectfully requests the objections be withdrawn.

II. Response to Claim Rejections Based on Anticipation and Obviousness

The Applicant respectfully submits that U.S. Patent 3,339,201 (hereinafter '201), U.S. application 2003/0071164 (hereinafter '164), and other cited references fail to disclose, teach, or

suggest all elements of the rejected claims for at least the reasons that follow. Specifically, '201 and '164 fail to disclose powering the IR decoy by a laser source. '201 discloses powering an IR decoy by way of a nozzle (item 4) discharging ignited fuel supplied by tubing (item 2) from the aircraft. '201 also discloses an electromagnetic decoy antenna for jamming or confusing electromagnetic detectors. '201 discloses these two separate decoys for deceiving different types of detectors. The ignited fuel decoy is designed to deceive an infrared detector and the electromagnetic decoy is designed to deceive electromagnetic energy detectors. Neither of these decoys suggests powering an IR decoy by photonic radiation from a fiber optic cable.

The Office cites to application '164 use of fiber-optic transmission lines used to transmit data from a towed body to an aircraft. The transmission lines disclosed are used to transmit data from the towed body. Application '164 does not disclose, teach or suggest using a laser source to produce an IR decoy or using these transmission lines as a source of power for an IR decoy. Application '164 is an application of the assignee in the present case. The Applicant respectfully submits Application '164 does not cure the above deficiencies. Therefore, independent

claims 1, 7, and 14 should be allowed for at least the above reasons.

The Applicant also respectfully submits that since claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-21 depend on independent claim 1, 7, and 14, respectively, claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-21 contain all limitations of independent claims 1, 7, and 14, respectively. Since independent claim 1, 7, and 14 should be allowed, as argued herein, pending dependent claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-21 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1608 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

III. Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.


CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and comments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and rejections have been traversed, rendered moot and/or accommodated, and that presently pending claims 1-9

and 11-21 are in condition for allowance. Applicant has responded to all of the Examiner's requests. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and the presently pending claims are hereby courteously requested. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene S. Rubin

By 
Andrew R. Martin, Esquire
Registration No. 45,413
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
835 Hanover Street, Suite 301
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104

Telephone: (603) 623-5111
Facsimile: (603) 624-1432

Date: 3-31-08